

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

FARRAH YOUSEFZADEH,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

ANYTHING ANYWHERE  
MOVING & STORAGE et al.,

Defendants and  
Respondents.

B286780

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. BC645322)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Mark V. Mooney, Judge. Affirmed.

Law Offices of Villalobos & Associates and Edward A. Villalobos for Plaintiff and Appellant.

Rosenberg & Koffman and Ronald G. Rosenberg for Defendants and Respondents.

---

Farrah Yousefzadeh appeals from a judgment entered after the trial court sustained demurrers to her second amended complaint without leave to amend. Based on the parties' briefs, the underlying dispute here appears to arise from events surrounding Yousefzadeh's January 2010 residential move.<sup>1</sup>

Yousefzadeh filed her original complaint in December 2016. On May 4, 2017, the trial court sustained demurrers to the original complaint with leave to amend. Yousefzadeh filed her first amended complaint on May 24, 2017. On July 12, 2017, the trial court sustained demurrers to the first amended complaint with leave to amend. On August 1, 2017, Yousefzadeh filed her second amended complaint. The trial court sustained demurrers to the second amended complaint without leave to amend on October 27, 2017. Yousefzadeh filed a timely notice of appeal.

The entire record on appeal consists of a 17-page clerk's transcript that includes only:

- The trial court case summary;
- A one-page minute order regarding the May 4, 2017 demurrer hearing;
- A one-page minute order regarding the July 12, 2017 demurrer hearing;
- A one-page minute order regarding the October 27, 2017 demurrer hearing;
- A two-page order sustaining demurrers to the second amended complaint without leave to amend;
- The notice of appeal; and
- The appellant's notice designating the record on appeal.

---

<sup>1</sup> The record contains no documents from which we could derive a factual background for the parties' dispute.

Yousefzadeh contends the trial court erred when it sustained demurrers to her complaints. Ordinarily, we would review the operative complaint de novo to determine whether it alleges facts stating a cause of action under any theory. (*Preven v. City of Los Angeles* (2019) 32 Cal.App.5th 925, \_\_\_\_.) This is not an ordinary case, however, because the record contains nothing for us to review.

“[I]t is a fundamental principle of appellate procedure that a trial court judgment is ordinarily presumed to be correct and the burden is on an appellant to demonstrate, on the basis of the record presented to the appellate court, that the trial court committed an error that justifies reversal of the judgment.” (*Jameson v. Desta* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 594, 608-609; *Mack v. All Counties Trustee Services, Inc.* (2018) 26 Cal.App.5th 935.) Yousefzadeh’s opening brief alludes to various theories upon which the trial court may have relied when it sustained demurrers. But the record does not contain any of the complaints Yousefzadeh filed, any of the memoranda of points and authorities in support of or opposing the demurrers to the complaints, any reporters’ transcripts from any of the demurrer hearings, or even anything that would definitively identify for us what causes of action Yousefzadeh alleged in her complaints. Yousefzadeh has failed to carry her burden of providing an adequate record upon which we might review the trial court’s judgment. Consequently, the trial court’s judgment is affirmed.

Respondents have requested sanctions against Yousefzadeh for filing a frivolous appeal pursuant to *Foust v. San Jose Construction Co., Inc.* (2011) 198 Cal.App.4th 181. The request for sanctions is denied.

**DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed. Respondents' request for sanctions is denied. Respondents are awarded costs on appeal.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

CHANEY, J.

We concur:

ROTHSCHILD, P. J.

BENDIX, J.